



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Quartos, but if the editor does not care to note orthographic differences, why should he include in his brief list the variants "than" for "then" and "Pallas" for "Pallace"? The inclusion of such variants leads the reader to believe that a thorough collation has been attempted. Textual omissions or errors like these might be cited from almost every page of the edition. Those mentioned have been chosen practically at random.

Other features of this work must be passed over briefly. The elucidatory notes, though judicious, will not prove especially illuminating to ordinary students. The special introductions to the plays are apparently products of haste and frequently contradict statements made elsewhere in the volumes.<sup>3</sup> To the General Introduction the editor would probably attach more value than to any other part of the work. His discussion of Greene's life and writings, while not marked by brilliancy of form or treatment, displays sanity in dealing with questions which have certainly provoked the exercise of other qualities in the past. In particular, his rejection of Grosart's theories as to Greene's ordination to the ministry and the authorship of *Selimus* will command general assent. It is to be regretted that Professor Collins did not know that he was anticipated in both cases, as well as in his proposed chronological order of Greene's plays, by Professor Gayley, whose introduction to the *Friar Bacon*<sup>4</sup> is the most sensible and accurate discussion of Greene's work that is now in print. Professor Collins's similar ignorance of Professor Manly's text of the *James IV*<sup>5</sup> with the emendations there proposed, is another cause for regret.

But most of those who are attracted to the book, especially that large class of scholars to whom the original Quartos are inaccessible, will be disposed to welcome the publication primarily as an authoritative text of Greene's plays. Their expectations will not be realized. For the statements made in the preface as to the fidelity and care with which the most important part of the task has been undertaken, are totally misleading.

ROBERT ADGER LAW.

University of Texas.

<sup>3</sup> For example, opinions expressed concerning the date of *Alphonsus*, I, 70, 74-75 are inconsistent with I, 39-42 on the same subject.

<sup>4</sup> *Representative English Comedies*, New York, 1903, pp. 397 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, Boston, 1900, II, 327 ff.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

TELL ME, WHERE IS FANCY BRED.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Has the immediate source ever been pointed out of the song in *Merchant of Venice*, III, 2:

Tell me, where is fancy bred,  
Or in the heart or in the head?  
How begot, how nourished?  
Reply, reply.  
It is engender'd in the eyes,  
With gazing fed; etc.?

A remote source is certainly the sonnet of Jacopo da Lentino, quoted by d'Ancona in his *Manuale della Letteratura Italiana*, Florence, 1904,—I, 62:

### NATURA E ORIGINE D'AMORE.

Amore è un disio che vien dal core,  
Per l'abbondanza di gran piacimento;  
E gli occhi in prima generan l'Amore,  
E lo core li dà nutrimento.

Bene è alcuna fiata uomo amatore  
Senza vedere suo 'nnamoramento;  
Ma quell' amor, che stringe con furore,  
Da la vista de gli occhi ha nascimento.

Che gli occhi rappresentano a lo core  
D'ogni cosa che veden bono e rio,  
Com' è formata naturalmente.

E lo cor che di ciò è concepitore,  
Immagina; e piace quel disio;  
E questo Amore regna fra la gente.

Perhaps some student of sources and of the various versions of conventional themes will find an interest in tracing the origins of this thirteenth century sonnet, and the links between it and Shakespeare's song.

L. M. HARRIS.

College of Charleston.

### MARY LUCRETIA DAVIDSON.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—I beg to call to the attention of your readers a biography of the American poetess, Mary Lucretia Davidson, in Italian, with selections from her poems, by Professor G. V. Calligari of the University of Padua.<sup>1</sup> It is nothing new that the study of English literature should be cultivated by learned Italians, but that an author so little known in her own country as Lucretia Davidson should be made the subject of special study is remarkable. Some explanation is to be found in the preface to this edition, from which one gathers that there is a personal and sentimental element, connected with the play by Gia-

<sup>1</sup> *Lucrezia Maria Davidson, con un saggio delle sue poesie. Padova, Verona, Drucker, 1906.*